

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 33 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,970,260 to *Roosen et al.*

Claims 18-28, 30-32, and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,782,402 to *Hidaka et al.* in view of *Roosen et al.*

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hidaka et al.* and *Roosen et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 to *Meyer et al.*

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hidaka et al.* in view of *Roosen et al.* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,123 to *Filepp et al.*

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 18, 33, 35, 37, and 38 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 18-33 and 35-38 are pending for consideration.

**ALL CLAIMS ARE ALLOWABLE****Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

The Office rejects claims 33 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

With respect to claim 33, the Office alleges that the feature, “wherein the display operation part has one or more divided screens and at least one screen shows common

information of a plurality of the image readers” is not disclosed in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Page 6, lines 16-21 of the specification and FIG. 4A discloses an exemplary display operation part having two screens wherein the left screen shows common information of all the scanners 2-1 to 2-n. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 33, as amended, meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 38, the Office alleges that the claim feature wherein the display operation part receives display information of “at least two of a plurality of image readers from the management device and receives display information unique to the image reader from the image reader” is not described in the specification. Without acquiescing to the Examiner’s allegation, Applicant amends claim 38 to advance prosecution. In particular, Applicant has amended claim 38 to recite, “at least two of a plurality of image readers based on the first operation instruction and displays second display information unique to the image reader, the first display information and the second display information are displayed in one screen of the display operation part.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Roosen et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 38, as amended, recites, in part, “wherein the display operation part displays first display information common to the at least two of a plurality of image readers based on the first operation instruction and displays second display information unique to the image reader, the first display information and the second display information are displayed in

one screen of the display operation part,” (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully asserts that *Roosen et al.* fails to teach or suggest a display operation party displaying display information of at least two of the plurality of image readers and display information unique to the image reader in one screen. As pointed out in M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated by a prior art reference only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found. Because *Roosen et al.* fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 38, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 18-28, 30-32, and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,782,402 to *Hidaka et al.* in view of *Roosen et al.*, claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hidaka et al.* and *Roosen et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 to *Meyer et al.*, claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hidaka et al.* in view of *Roosen et al.* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,123 to *Filepp et al.*

Independent claim 18, as amended, recites, in part, a display operation part displaying “first display information common to the at least two of the plurality of image readers based on the first operation instruction” and displaying “second display information unique to the image reader, the first display information and the second display information pertain to setting of the operation instructions,” (emphasis added). Similarly, independent claim 35, as amended, recites, in part, a display operation part “wherein the common display information and the information unique to the image reader pertains to setting of the operation instruction.”

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Hidaka et al.* and *Roosen et al.* merely disclose a display operation part displaying information of the image file or the list of waiting orders.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Hidaka et al.* and *Roosen et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest display information which indicates operation instruction, as required by independent claims 18 and 35, as amended.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because *Hidaka et al.* and *Roosen et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 18 and 35, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Furthermore, claims 19-32 depend from independent claim 18, and claim 36 depends from claim 35. Accordingly, claims 19-32 and 36 are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above. *Filepp et al.* and *Meyer et al.* fail to cure the deficiencies in *Hidaka et al.* and *Roosen et al.*

#### **Request for Withdrawal of Finality**

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner never properly considered and examined every feature of independent claims 18 and 35, and hence dependent claims 19-32 and 36 in the Final Office Action dated June 6, 2007. Page 5 of the Final Office Action alleges that col. 2, line 44-col. 3, line 16 of *Hidaka et al.* discloses a “storage portion for storing an image file retrievable by a management device.” However, the Examiner has failed to rebut Applicant’s arguments directed toward an image reader including a storage part. As directed by MPEP 707.07(f), “[w]here the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant’s argument **and answer the substance of it**” (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has not addressed Applicant’s arguments set forth in the Amendment filed on March 13, 2007. Thus, Applicant further asserts that the finality of the Final Office Action dated June 6, 2007 should be

withdrawn in order for Applicant to receive answers to the arguments set forth in the Amendment filed on March 13, 2007, and reiterated below.

*Hidaka et al.* discloses a copy system 1 that includes a scanner 20 connected to copy server 10 (Col. 10, lines 6-9.) As shown in FIG. 1 of *Hidaka et al.*, the hard disk 13 is located in the copy server 10, not the scanner 20. (Col. 10, lines 10-17.) Similarly, *Roosen et al.* discloses a number of scanners 5, 6, and 7 connected to a scan request manager (SRM) 4. (Col. 3, lines 23-27.) As shown in FIG. 1 of *Roosen et al.*, data storage 9, which stores digitized documents, is connected to the SRM 4. (Col. 3, lines 37-45.) Thus, both *Hidaka et al.* and *Roosen et al.* fail to teach or suggest an image reader including a storage part that stores a processed image, the processed image being retrievable by a management device, as recited by claim 18, or an image reader including a storage part that stores the image read by the reading part, the image being retrievable by a management device, as recited by claim 35.

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 33 and 37 have been amended to include the feature recited above. Applicant respectfully asserts that *Filepp et al.* and *Meyer et al.* fail to cure the deficiencies in *Hidaka et al.* and *Roosen et al.* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 18-33 and 35-37 are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 be entered by the Examiner, placing all pending claims in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite the prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: July 24, 2007

By: Mary Jane Boswell  
Mary Jane Boswell  
Reg. No. 33,652

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: 202-739-3000  
Fax: 202-739-3100